

11

14

16

17

19

21

23

24

26

27

28 plaintiffs' amended complaint was to be filed by May 23, 2006.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR INVOLUNTARY DISMISSAL C-06-00330 RMW SPT

April 28, 2006 the court heard oral argument on Fair Isaac, Lowe's, and Macy's motions to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint for failure to state a claim. On May 3, 2006 the court issued an order granting defendants' motions to dismiss. The court granted Fair Isaac's motion to dismiss with prejudice except as to plaintiffs' first cause of action. The court granted Macy's and Lowe's motion to dismiss with prejudice as to plaintiffs' second cause of action. Plaintiffs were given twenty (20) days leave to amend. Plaintiffs filed their amended complaint on May 30, 2006, seven days late.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) provides in relevant part "[f]or failure of the plaintiff to prosecute or to comply with these rules or any order of court, a defendant may move for dismissal of an action or of any claim against the defendant." In the Ninth Circuit, involuntary dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) may be proper where a plaintiff, given the opportunity to amend or be dismissed, does nothing. Edwards v. Marin Park, Inc., 356 F.3d 1058, 1064 (9th Cir. 2004). In Edwards, the Ninth Circuit noted that where a plaintiff is given "the opportunity to amend or be dismissed [and does] nothing[,]... resources continue to be consumed by a case sitting idly on the court's docket." *Id.* The district court must consider five factors in determining whether to dismiss a case under Rule 41(b): "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives." Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit "may affirm a dismissal where at least four factors support dismissal, or where at least three factors 'strongly' support dismissal." *Id.* 

As in both Yourish and Edwards, the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation and the court's need to manage its docket support dismissal where, as here, following a finding of failure to state a claim plaintiffs are given an opportunity to amend but fail to amend within the allotted time. In *Yourish*, the Ninth Circuit agreed with the district court's finding that "[p]laintiffs' noncompliance has caused the action to come to a complete halt, thereby allowing [p]laintiffs to control the pace of the docket rather than the [c]ourt" and held "the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation always favors dismissal." *Id.* On the other hand, the public policy favoring

The twenty days were from the date of the court's written order, which meant

2

## Case 5:06-cv-00330-RMW Document 84 Filed 06/09/06 Page 3 of 4

disposition of cases on their merits weighs against dismissal. Here, plaintiffs' counsel did not move to enlarge time or otherwise notify the court or opposing counsel of the reasons why an amended complaint was not filed by the date ordered by the court. Clearly, plaintiffs' disregard of the Local Rules as well as the courtesies due opposing counsel and the court was inappropriate. Nevertheless, the court does not find that the delay presents prejudice to defendants warranting dismissal. This is plaintiffs' first amendment to the complaint and, at this early stage in the litigation, the court concludes that there are less drastic alternatives than dismissal. Plaintiffs are advised in future to refer to and follow the applicable Local Rules if they are unable to meet filing deadlines.

ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES defendants' motion for involuntary dismissal

For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES defendants' motion for involuntary dismissal pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

DATED: 6/8/06 Pondle of Whyte RONALD M. WHYTE United States District Judge

The court notes that plaintiffs had also filed their oppositions to Fair Isaac, Macy's, and Lowe's motions to dismiss ten days late.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR INVOLUNTARY DISMISSAL C-06-00330 RMW SPT 3

1	Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:
2	Counsel for Plaintiffs:
3	Stanley Hilton FROG727@AOL.COM
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Counsel for Defendants:  Deborah Barack Albert Finch Martin L. Fineman Brian C. Frontino Deanna L. Johnston James R. McGuire Stacy Marie Monahan Andrew W. Moritz Stephen Michael Rummage William L. Stern Derve V. Swingle  dbarack@stroock.com tfinch@eakdl.com edithshertz@dwt.com bfrontino@stroock.com dljohnston@jonesday.com jmcguire@mofo.com smonahan@jonesday.com Amoritz@Stroock.com steverummage@dwt.com wstern@mofo.com
11 12 13	Darya V. Swingle daryaswingle@dwt.com Michele Kathleen Trausch mtrausch@hansonbridgett.com Julia H. Veit jveit@hansonbridgett.com Chris Jacob Young cyoung@mofo.com Felicia Yu fyu@reedsmith.com
14 15 16 17	Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.
18 19 20	Dated: 6/9/06 SPT Chambers of Judge Whyte
21   22	
23 24	
25	
26	
27 28	
	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR INVOLUNTARY DISMISSAL C-06-00330 RMW SPT 4